

U.S. Department of Homeland Security 20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20536





FILE:

EAC 02 116 51218

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION:

Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as an Alien of Extraordinary Ability Pursuant to Section

203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director Administrative Appeals Office

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly anwarranted invasion of personal privacy

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The petition is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A), as an alien of extraordinary ability in the sciences. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary has earned the sustained national or international acclaim necessary to qualify for classification as an alien of extraordinary ability.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel does not state the basis for the appeal to the AAO and submits no new evidence for consideration with the appeal. Counsel indicates on the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal to the Administrative Appeals Unit, that a brief and additional evidence would be submitted to the AAO within 30 days of filing the appeal. However, as of the date of this decision, more than six months after the appeal was filed, no additional documents have been received by the AAO.

Inasmuch as the petitioner has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.